DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 668 EA 023 148

AUTHOR Belzer, Sharolyn J.
TITLE An Exploratory Study of Principals' Reports of School Policies and Practices Using a Goal Theory Framework.
INSTITUTION National Center for School Leadership, Urbana, IL.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 91
CONTRACT RI17C8003
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Educational Objectives; Elementary Education; Mastery Learning; Outcomes of Education; *Principals; School Policy; *Student Educational Objectives; *Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

To identify school-level policies and practices and to see if they reinforced mastery and performance goals for students, interviews were conducted with five principals in schools participating in a collaborative effort to move selected classrooms toward a focus on mastery and learning. Interviews were designed to help understand how principals' goals related to the implementation of school policy, how their approach might differ from that of teachers, and how goals are communicated from the superintendent to principals to teachers to students. Anecdotes are employed to illustrate variation in the goals and practices of the principals and of the superintendent who was also interviewed. Two major themes are explored in the interview analysis: (1) the extent to which the emphasis on mastery and performance goals coexist and conflict across district, school; and (2) classroom levels and the extent to which the superintendent's expectations and articulated policies impact the autonomy of principals, teachers, and the everyday life of students. The results suggest that school and district administrators must work together with teachers to ensure that policies and practices within classroom, district, and school are compatible. (19 references) (EJS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334668

An Exploratory Study of Principals' Reports of School Policies and Practices Using a Goal Theory Framework

Sharolyn J. Belzer

School of Education
University of Michigan

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The writing of this paper and the research on which it was based were supported by the National Center for School Leadership (OERI. Grant No. R117C8003). The author of this paper wishes to express special thanks to Carol Midgley, Martin Maehr, and Elizabeth de Groot for assistance in developing the interviews, for collaborative insights, and for their constructive comments on drafts of this article. Communication regarding this paper should be directed to Sharolyn J. Belzer, The University of Michigan, Leadership and Learning Laboratory, 1418 School of Education Building, 610 E. University Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI. 48109-1259, (313) 747-0626.

EA 023 148

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Belzer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This paper is based on interviews with five principals in schools participating in a collaborative effort to move selected classrooms toward a focus on mastery and learning. During a similar intervention directed by Carole Ames, teachers expressed some hostility toward principals and did not want them involved in the change efforts. In addition, there was some evidence that principals set policies and implemented practices at a school level that contradicted or undermined the mastery-oriented strategies teachers were developing at the classroom level. Principals in the new study were interviewed to understand how their goals related to the implementation of school policy, how their approach might differ from that of teachers, and how goals are communicated from the superintendent to principals to teachers to students, particularly when goals are in conflict and coexist at these various levels. Anecdotes are employed to illustrate variation in the goals and practices of the superintendent and principals in this district. This study suggests that principals and administrators must work in concert with teachers to insure that policies and practices within the classroom, the school, and the district are compatible.

INTRODUCTION

Most attempts to influence what goes on in classrooms involve interventions with teachers and/or students. While some classroom interventions have seemed promising, changes made at the classroom level may not persist if they are not supported by principals or administrators at the school or district levels. In order for changes to persist at the classroom level, the school environment should be structured in such a way that the goals in the classroom and the school are compatible. This necessitates involvement of not only teachers and students, but also principals and administrators. A first step is to explore the relationship between principals' goals and the policies and practices they promulgate in their schools. A second step is to examine the relationship among the superintendent's goals, principals' goals, and teachers' goals. This paper reviews the research on the role of goals and purposes in achievement settings, and uses extended interviews with principals and a superintendent to explore these relationships.

Recent research indicates that the goals children pursue in an academic setting influence their motivation and learning (Ames, 1990; Ames & Archer, 1988). Two types of achievement goals have been identified: "mastery" goals (also referred to as "task-focused" or "learning" goals) and "performance" goals (also referred to as "ability-focused" or "ego-oriented" goals). When students are primarily mastery-oriented, they focus on the task, learn for the sake of learning, and challenge themselves as they develop understanding, skills, and a sense of accomplishment. When students are primarily performance-oriented, they focus on their own ability, comparing themselves with their peers, and choosing easy tasks that will guarantee that they are successful. Considerable research suggests that students pursue different goals (Dweck, 1986; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988) and that students within the same classroom differ in how they interpret their academic experiences (Blumenfeld, Pintrich, Meece, & Wessels, 1982; Marshall & Weinstein, 1986; Ryan & Grolnick, 1986). Rosenholtz and Simpson (1984) argue that "the extent to which any student adopts a mastery or performance orientation depends on how each student constructs the social reality of the classroom for himself or herself".

In an experimental study in which they manipulated teacher goals, Ames, Maehr, Archer and others (1989) found that "teachers who adopt mastery versus performance goals for their students differ in their beliefs about how classroom learning should be organized and in their instructional decision making processes". Teachers endorsed different instructional objectives and practices when they adopted mastery or performance goals. These researchers suggest that identifying and modifying teachers' goals may facilitate instructional changes at the classroom level. Ames and her colleagues (1989) go on to say that "certain types of classroom experiences can affect the salience of mastery and performance goals and thereby influence how students approach and engage in the process of learning". If students' goals are influenced by the structure of the learning environment, the classroom parameters that influence students' goals must be identified (Ames, 1990). Research suggests that most elementary classroom environments have a weak mastery orientation (Brophy, 1983). If enhancing the likelihood that students will adopt mastery goals is our objective, teachers must learn how to structure the classroom learning environment to promote the adoption of such an orientation.

Teachers influence the goals students pursue in the classroom (Ames, 1989). In a study by Blumenfeld and Meece, instructional strategies were related to qualitatively distinguishable classroom characteristics, and influenced the goal orientation of elementary science students (Meece, 1990). Results suggest that "teachers of low versus high mastery-oriented classes differed in the extent to which they promoted meaningful learning, adapted instruction to the developmental levels and personal interests of their students, established learning structures supportive of student autonomy and peer collaboration, and emphasized the intrinsic value of learning" (Meece, 1990).

Recently, research projects aimed at helping teachers move toward mastery-oriented classroom environments have been implemented in Illinois and Michigan (Ames, Maehr, et al., 1989; Midgley & Maehr, 1990; Ames, 1990). These projects involve collaboration between researchers and elementary teachers to develop mastery-oriented strategies. Ames and Archer (1988) defined mastery and performance goals in terms of actual classroom parameters; a summary of classroom parameters is presented in Table 1. Carole Ames (1989) borrowed Joyce Epstein's (1987b) acronym TARGET as an organizational framework for describing and categorizing strategies in terms of classroom goal structures. Teachers involved in the intervention proposed strategies designed to reflect mastery goals in each of the TARGET areas, including the **nature of academic tasks**, **authority**, **reward and recognition**, **grouping**, **evaluation**, and **time**. After several months, children in the treatment classrooms scored significantly higher on measures of mastery orientation, than did children in control classrooms (Ames, 1990). In conversations with Ames, she mentioned that teachers complained that policies and practices endorsed and promulgated by principals often undermined the changes teachers were implementing in the classroom. For example, if teachers were attempting to structure their classrooms so that students cooperated with one another, helping each other learn, this could be undermined if principals encouraged competition within and among classrooms. Policies adopted by the principal, and implemented at the school level, may conflict with and counter what teachers are doing in their classrooms.

Considerable research has been conducted on the role of principals in effective school leadership and in influencing the school culture (Krug, Ahadi, & Scott, 1990; Anderman, Smith, & Belzer, 1991). However, little research has been conducted on how the goals of principals and administrators influence teacher and student goals (Maehr, & Midgley, in press; Maehr, in press). Midgley and Maehr (1990) indicate that "these contrasting approaches to learning (mastery and performance emphases) are under the control of district and school personnel. Administrators and teachers decide, either as a group or individually, how students are grouped, which students to recognize and on what basis, whether to encourage competition or cooperation among students, if and how student autonomy is to be encouraged, methods for evaluating students, and a host of other policies and practices". Midgley and Maehr (personal communication) are currently working in both elementary and middle schools to implement comprehensive programs to examine and change school policies and procedures in a way that will move the school as a whole toward a mastery focus.

Table 1
Achievement Goal Analysis of School Climate

CLIMATE DIMENSIONS	TASK-BASED GOALS	PERFORMANCE GOALS
Success defined as . . .	improvement, progress, mastery	high grades, high performance compared to others
Value placed on . . .	effort/learning	public acknowledgement of achievement, demonstrating high ability compared to others
Reasons for satisfaction . . .	progress, challenge, mastery	doing better than others, success with little effort
Instruction oriented toward . . .	how students are learning, progressing	students' comparative performance levels
Focus of attention . . .	process of learning	performance relative to others
Reasons for effort . . .	learn something new	high grades, perform better than others
Evaluation criteria . . .	absolute criteria; evidence of progress	norms; social comparisons
Type of involvement . . .	all participants; high degree of choice	differential participation by ability; low choice
Errors viewed as . . .	part of the learning process	failure

Adapted from work by C. Ames et al. (Ames & Archer, 1988; Ames, Maehr, Archer, Fisher & Hall, 1989)

The study discussed in this paper was conducted in conjunction with the classroom level intervention described earlier (Ames, 1989). The purpose of this study is to examine the goals of principals and administrators to determine whether school-wide policies or practices undermine or facilitate goals that are being stressed by teachers within the classroom. Specifically, principals may set policies within the school that reflect a performance orientation, while the purpose of the intervention program is to encourage teachers to use mastery-oriented strategies. A select group of principals was interviewed to try to understand how their achievement goals were reflected in school policy, how their goals differed from those of classroom teachers, and how these policies might conflict with the classroom intervention program.

METHODS

Extensive interviews were conducted with five elementary school principals and the district superintendent in order to identify school level policies and practices, and to determine if these practices reinforced "mastery" or "performance" goals. The collaborative interview technique was employed (Kelly, 1987). Each interview was scheduled to last for about one hour. With the permission of those being interviewed, interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed. Names have been changed to protect the identity of the superintendent and principals interviewed. Because the interviews were exploratory in nature, tapes were not systematically coded but were reviewed extensively for themes. Anecdotes were selected to illustrate those themes. The interpretation of interviews and identification of themes are subjective because I was the only researcher conducting the interviews, listening to, and interpreting the tapes. However, themes were developed following extensive collaboration with colleagues at the University of Michigan. Data collected in this study are currently being used to develop survey instruments for use with teachers and administrators (Midgley & Maehr, personal communication). Observational notes were also recorded for each interview, describing the setting where the interview took place, interruptions, and affect expressed during the interviews.

Some of the policies that principals have established within their schools were mandated by the state, school district, or the school board; while other policies were informally encouraged by the superintendent or school board, or implemented by principals, with little administrative directive. Principals were questioned regarding both formal and informal policies, and how they conveyed these policies to their staff. Policies and practices were discussed using the TARGET areas stressed in the classroom level intervention studies. Though many of the same questions were asked of all of the principals, the interviews were semi-structured so that topics were explored more fully with some principals than with others. As an interviewer, I permitted flexibility in the interviews, particularly in areas where principals possessed expertise (testing or report card coordinator for the district, background and training in special education, etc.), in order to learn as much as possible about policies and practices within the district and within each school. In many cases it was necessary to ask several follow-up questions to assess whether these policies and practices reflected "mastery" or "performance" goals within the schools. Open ended questions allowed principals more control over what we discussed in the interviews, often creating a

more comfortable and conversational environment in which principals could share with me their experiences, frustrations, goals, and future expectations.

All elementary level principals interviewed were from a school district in southeastern Michigan, characterized as middle to lower-middle class. This district has a substantial minority population (37%), and 40% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Two of the five principals were employed as principals within the district for less than a year at the time of their interview. The remaining three principals had been employed in their current positions for not less than four years at the time of their interview.

The superintendent of the district was also interviewed. This interview used the same format as the principal interviews, but was more focused because the time the superintendent could devote to the interview was limited to about thirty minutes. In particular, questions centered on policies and practices (formal and informal) for rewarding and recognizing students and teachers.

Description of Principals and Superintendent

Mae Andhr[1] had been the principal of a relatively small neighborhood school for five years, and a teacher within the district prior to becoming principal. Mae had served on the report card committee and currently was the testing coordinator for the district. She appeared to be a people-oriented principal, solving problems directly, and when necessary, taking care of 'private business' with staff and students behind closed doors so that gossip was kept to a minimum. Mae spoke of herself as an oral communicator: "I'm an oral communicator and that's the way I try to do things; to me when you get things in black and white it becomes something to be nervous about and is there for a long time but if you talk about it, it's in the air and gone as soon as we leave the room. Not only that, if I put out a lot of memos, then I'll have to check - I'd rather know that you're doing it because you're a professional person and so that's the way I run the building." Mae is frustrated with many of the social problems that the children in her school must cope with today. "My frustration is that I'm not helping. Eventually the children may be helped if they can get a decent education and get out of their situation. But what children need is now and most of the time I can't do anything for their problems. I can be a listener and try not to get angry. Some days I forget and get angry!"

Susan Chin is the principal of the largest elementary school in the district; this school is not located within a neighborhood. She was a teacher for twenty-one years and had never given any thought to becoming a principal. When asked by the principal, she accepted an interim position, and was subsequently selected, by administrators as well as teachers in the school, to become the new principal. Susan had only been the principal for about three months at the time of her interview. As a new principal, she mentioned that she was surprised by the number of interruptions that kept her from spending as much time in classrooms as she would have liked. Susan frequently mentioned that she was "working under the guidelines established by the previous principal, so as not to upset teachers, students, or parents midstream".

---

1 All names are fictitious.

However, Susan had clear conceptions of how she wanted to modify policies during the following year. Susan wanted the school to be a place where "every child will come wanting to be here, feel safe, secure and stimulated, a place where teachers recognize individual differences more often and honor them in children and in others, and a place where there is more harmony among the staff and pride among teachers, that this is our place, so let's take care of it and respect each other".

The third principal, Andy Lind, has been an educator within the district for twenty years. He taught high school, became a guidance counselor, and had been an assistant principal at the high school and middle school levels prior to becoming the principal of a relatively small neighborhood school four years ago. Andy gives teachers considerable autonomy on classroom related issues, such as homework, schoolwork, grading, and 'at risk' policies. This principal is strongly influenced by the testing emphasis of the superintendent; he indicated that "achievement on standardized tests is paramount in determining the curriculum" and that as a principal, with a degree in guidance and counselling, he understood the value of tests and shared his knowledge on the proper utilization of tests with his teachers. Andy was very much a policy-oriented principal - he disagreed with the superintendent on several policies. He suggested the need for schools to address and make changes for 'at risk' students. He indicated that school attendance should be emphasized more at the elementary school level so that children would receive a consistent message that school is important throughout their school years.

Martha Smitae had been a principal at a relatively large neighborhood school for about seven months at the time of her interview. Prior to taking this position, Martha was a special education administrator, and had taught at the elementary level. Unlike Susan Chin, Martha took the position as principal in September, with the start of a new school year, and was therefore able to initiate changes she wished to make more easily. She wanted the school to be a safe and supportive environment for the children, as well as a learning environment; a place where the self-esteem of students could be built up and where values as well as respect and pride could be taught. Martha spends much time in the classrooms. She emphasized collaboration, suggesting that it was essential for teachers as well as administrators to capitalize on the strengths of each other. "Teachers can help each other where they have strengths. Teachers feel that they have to be good at everything - if they work together as a family and complement each other, the whole is much greater than the sum of the parts." Martha prefers team teaching so that all students, including those in special education, can be taught by the entire staff; each teacher can work with many students in areas where they are most confident and comfortable.

Carla Mixen had been the principal of a moderately sized elementary school for five years. Although the school is located within a neighborhood, it is relatively isolated from the other schools within the district. Because the neighborhood is considered unsafe by many, the school is a center for activity. For these reasons the principal believes that her school serves a special need. Carla taught art and special education, has been a teacher consultant for emotionally and learning disabled students, and a special education administrator. Her interest in special education is obvious; she spends a substantial amount of time with her teacher consultant and works with teachers, children, and parents,"brainstorming on new options that will

work within the classroom and school, without moving to any other policies, such as referrals for testing and placement in special education classes". Carla suggests, "All principals are not equally conversant in special education problems. If you're in touch with this population in the school and have successful interventions for your 'at risk' group of kids, problems are cut down a lot because otherwise they will take up all of your time." This principal is very matter of fact, a strong administrator who works to identify and resolve problems as quickly as possible.

The superintendent of the district, Daniel Dietrite is amicable, good-natured, and charismatic. Daniel Dietrite has been the superintendent of the district for two and a half years, and has been involved in education for twenty-six years. He is casually referred to as 'Dr. Dan' by students, teachers, and principals alike. He endorses a clear district mission - that all students can learn, and strongly promotes achievement within the district, with a particular emphasis on standardized testing. Since the district is poor, the superintendent is concerned that the money spent for education not be wasted. He has announced to all of his principals that he is looking for new ideas and promises to listen to them. Principals appear to feel comfortable working for him, and relatively unconstrained by district policies. Perhaps one reason, suggested by Mae Andhr, is that "what works for one school is not necessarily expected to work for another".

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

My analysis of the interviews reveals differences in principal goals that may explain some of the variance in policies and practices among the schools. Two major themes will be explored in my analysis. These themes include: (1) the extent to which the emphasis on mastery and performance goals coexist and conflict across district, school, and classroom levels, and (2) the extent to which the superintendent's expectations and articulated policies impact the autonomy of principals, teachers, and the everyday life of students.

During my interviews with principals and the superintendent, the extent to which mastery and performance goals coexist and conflict at district, school, and classroom levels was noted in many areas. Two topics - school interest in increasing student self-esteem, and the use of intrinsic versus extrinsic rewards, will be investigated in an attempt to identify and understand these issues.

School-wide Focus on Improving Student Self-Esteem

School interest in increasing student self-esteem is explored to demonstrate that mastery and performance goals may coexist. Four of the five principals interviewed specifically indicated that their schools promoted programs for building the self-esteem of students or that teachers realized how important it was to improve student self-esteem. Mae Andhr was the only principal who did not directly mention self-esteem, though her interest in promoting it could be inferred from other topics of conversation. Some principals, namely Mae Andhr, Susan Chin, and Martha Smitae, implemented programs in which they wrote notes to, or had lunch with students, in order to get to know them, or sometimes to reward them for improvement, good

behavior, or the accomplishment of a major goal that may have been difficult for the student. Mae Andhr, for example, linked self-esteem with high expectations on the part of teachers and students. She noticed that many of her students did not have high expectations, and suggested that teachers attempt to change student expectations by telling children, "When you get a job or go to college, you will need to do this...", and the like. Teachers told her that having and conveying high expectations to their students really made a difference, presumably in the students expectations for themselves and in improving student self-esteem. Martha Smitae said of her students, "I want to get kids to community college - possessing skills and able to make decisions. We take fourth and fifth graders on field trips to the community college and make them aware of programs - I want them to have hope. I tell the parents a story at open house about my self-disability and the teacher who told me I could do it! Kids have to believe in themselves - I want kids to do this. They have choices - we must get this message to parents." Although Andy Lind and Carla Mixen advocated improving student self-esteem, their contact with students did not appear to be as direct; instead, they encouraged teachers to promote student self-esteem.

Increasing the self-esteem of students is certainly not in conflict with the classroom goal of improving the mastery orientation of students. However, there are two approaches to improving self-esteem. One approach is to change the classroom environment so that all children can feel successful (the goal of the intervention program). A different approach is to work on children - encourage them, praise them, recognize them but not actually change their day-to-day experiences in classrooms. In developing programs to enhance self-esteem, these principals seemed to imply that children have a problem because they do not exhibit high self-esteem. Therefore, efforts are aimed at individual children - hugging them, rewarding them, supporting them. The intervention at the school and classroom levels has a different focus. Rather than working on children directly - the focus is on changing the school and the classroom so that all children can be successful. When children are successful, their self-esteem is likely to change accordingly. Indeed, it probably is the case that only through the perception that one is accomplishing something in school, learning, that self-esteem will be enhanced. It may be necessary to change policies and practices at the school level so that all children are placed in a mastery-focused environment where they can experience success. A school-wide approach for improving student self-esteem would insure a more global focus where classroom and school policies are consistent, and students are immersed in a school culture that is not only conducive to learning but to promoting student self-esteem through the process of learning.

Coexistence and Perceived Differences Among Goals

Principals may have unknowingly undermined student self-esteem through some of their actions, while promoting self-esteem through other actions. Specifically, principals possessed mastery as well as performance goals, and this influenced the support that principals expressed for pull-out programs. While Susan Chin expressed the need to limit pull-out programs so that classrooms did not become a 'revolving door' and interfere with the continuous classroom instruction of students, Andy Lind planned to initiate a new program, the "Renzuli Model" which would effectively segregate 20% of the brighter students, by providing school assemblies and special instruction for these students. What effect do such programs have on the self-esteem

of those students not included in the program? Andy has implemented pull-out programs for both high and low achieving students, including a Junior Great Books and community college computer program for exceptionally bright students (acceptance into the program based on high standardized test scores and teacher recommendations) as well as tutoring and special education programs for low achieving students. What effect does this kind of segregation have on student se esteem, particularly for low achieving students who already have low self-esteer While this practice might promote the self-esteem of bright children, it is likely tc undermine the self-esteem of 'at risk' children. Andy may further emphasize the dichotomy between his high and low achieving students by focusing on the "uniqueness of his school population - with students from both economic extremes - the children of professionals who place a high emphasis on education and do very well, and the children from a lower income housing project who are often 'at risk' and don't have the same educational objectives". On the other hand, Andy was the only principal who mentioned posting both an honor roll to recognize achievement and a bug roll (bringing up one grade) to recognize improvement and enhance student self-esteem. In contrast, Carla Mixen and Martha Smitae, who both have backgrounds in special education, have opposite opinions on the value of pull-out programs. Carla favors the use of pull-outs when all other options for a student have been exhausted, whereas Martha advocates an inclusive school environment, where pull-outs are not necessary because the students and staff are working together and the self-esteem of all students is maximized.

In summary, all principals believe that promoting student self-esteem is necessary. Some principals have initiated programs that increase their interaction with students, while others are not as directly involved with students but encourage teachers to improve student self-esteem. Programs to improve student self-esteem may not be effective if students function in an environment that contradicts the intentions of the program or provides them with an inconsistent message. Furthermore, principals exhibit both mastery and performance goals; these goals coexist and influence the policies and practices of principals. Principals do not appear to be aware that they have coexisting and contradictory goals that can both enhance and undermine student self-esteem.

Approaches to Rewarding Students

Not only can the coexisting goals that principals possess contradict one another, but mastery and performance goals may be in conflict at district, school, and classroom levels. This was demonstrated by examining policies on the use of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards at the various levels. The superintendent strongly advocated the use of extrinsic rewards in the recognition of student achievement and performance, as well as improvement. The superintendent initiated partnerships with a number of business establishments, particularly fast food restaurants, because he believes that "it is very important to promote achievement and reward positive behavior. In education, we haven't done enough to promote positive reinforcement. Even though there is nothing in writing, I have strong feelings about reinforcement in the schools." At the high school level, the superintendent established a "Renaissance Program," based on the idea that "if you do the work, you get something for it". This program involves a business partnership with McDonald's: Students are given different colored picture identification cards, depending on the grades they earn, and each card has its

respective privileges. Students who earn straight "A's" receive a gold card; are not required to take final exams; and receive a free Coke, fries and Big Mac on presenting their cards at participating McDonald's. Students who earn all "A's" and "B's" receive a red card, entitling them to free parking at the high school and a 20% discount on food purchased at McDonald's. This program certainly must have an impact on student self-esteem - probably, a negative one. The possession or lack of a color coded card makes it obvious who are the winners and losers in the school. When students who were not earning all "A's" and "B's" came to the superintendent and said, "What about us - we don't like this program. We're doing our best, but it's not all "A's" and "B's"," the superintendent instituted the white card, given to students who receive no failing grades, granting them privileges such as free admission to home games, and the like. When asked if the "Renaissance Program" would be implemented at the elementary level, the superintendent indicated that because the program was only in its first year at the high school level, it was unlikely to be expanded. However, ultimately he hoped to expand this concept to other school levels. The superintendent endorsed other extrinsic rewards for performance as well, including the personal presentation of awards to students who achieve the highest scores on standardized tests, and the promise of lunch for the entire school if they scored high enough on standardized achievement tests. In addition, the superintendent gives monetary rewards to the most improved students each year.

Articulation of Policies and Practices for Rewarding Students

Given the strong emphasis on the use of extrinsic rewards by the superintendent, I questioned him on what he communicated to principals regarding the recognition and reward of students. Surprisingly, he responded, "I don't specifically discuss it with them but the tone and mission for the district are very clear - that we like to improve achievement and behavior. Anything we can do to promote this - we'll do." How well does the emphasis by the superintendent on extrinsic rewards get articulated to principals, teachers, and finally, to students? Obviously, students are directly affected by the administrative practices of the superintendent (such as the Renaissance Program) but the effects on school leadership (principals and teachers) and school culture may be less direct. When principals were asked about formal administrative policies and practices, they unanimously indicated that there were very few. The superintendent stated that "No policies are in writing - I really need to do that some day!" Formal policies regarding the reward and recognition of students include the requirement to hold two school awards assemblies each year, one recognizing students who complete their summer testing packets and another rewarding students who perform well on standardized tests and improve during the year. Although the superintendent is quite charismatic, when asked whether he spoke directly with his principals regarding the focus of the assemblies, the superintendent replied, "Recognition, improvement, as well as achievement - they do all those things and I let them handle the assemblies any way they wish". When principals were asked about the focus of their awards assemblies, only Martha Smitae indicated that her "emphasis for the teachers was not just on achievement but to award kids that accomplish things that are hard for them". Other principals indicated that they recognize achievement, leadership, citizenship, behavior and improvement, but the extent to which each was emphasized depended on the goals of each principal, so the focus in the assemblies was likely to vary.

Informal policies are more numerous. Principals are encouraged (but not necessarily required) to take advantage of business partnerships and to reward achievement and good behavior whenever possible, particularly through the use of extrinsic rewards. There was variation in the extent to which principals linked up with businesses, and in the kind of rewards emphasized by principals. Mae Andhr and Susan Chin never mentioned business partnerships during the course of their interviews. Martha Smitae briefly acknowledged a partnership with Domino's, indicating that sometimes Domino's pizza is ordered when students have lunch with the principal. Martha was the only principal who tries not to give material rewards to children, suggesting instead that she honors students by allowing them to do something for the principal, teachers, or the school, like planting flowers outside. Carla Mixen mentioned both Ponderosa (perfect attendance program) and Pizza Hut (Book-It - provides free pizza to students or classes who read large quantities of books, not necessarily well) as businesses that are associated with all of the schools within the district. Finally, Andy Lind was most enthusiastic about the business partnership concept; he was quite proud of the fact that his school had formed a partnership with McDonald's, whereas none of the other elementary schools in the district had done so. Andy indicated that the partnership "provided a lot of incentives and motivational rewards for students in the whole building". For example, he used the partnership concept to encourage kids to persuade their parents to attend the parent teacher conferences, suggesting that "kids have the same need to have a burger, and the school benefits by getting parents in that wouldn't otherwise come in, and students benefit".

While principals vary in the extent to which they associate with businesses, most principals condone rewarding students extrinsically, particularly for good behavior in the lunch room. Mae Andhr gives 'cast notes' to students for good behavior. If everyone in the class gets a cast note during the month, then the class wins an ice cream party. A drawing at the end of the school year from all of the cast notes given during the year entitles seven winners to a limousine ride and lunch with the principal. Mae Andhr, Andy Lind and Carla Mixen indicated that it was necessary to recognize positive behaviors and not overemphasize behavior problems. Susan Chin rewards winners of a lunch room behavior contest with roller skating parties or with popcorn and a movie. Andy Lind has had a lunch behavior program for three years. "Originally a trophy was given to the winning class each week following a friendly competition, but last year we started a monthly competition where the best behaved classroom gets a free lunch catered in by McDonald's, delivered either to their classroom or to the lunchroom (in front of other students). Now the competition is much keener than with the trophy. Last month two classes tied and this shows us that bad behavior is on the decline." What policies and practices regarding the competition for rewards and student cooperation in learning, do principals use in their schools and encourage teachers to use in their classrooms? School-wide policies on essay contests, lunch room behavior contests, science fairs, spelling bees, and other competitions are likely to set the tone for competition and/or cooperation within each building. In a school environment where cooperation is fostered, all students can be recognized for improvement, as they work to make progress and to learn new skills. In a school where competition is highly valued, relatively few students are recognized for improvement; the goal becomes one of competing against classmates rather than of optimizing learning.

In summary, in most cases the emphasis on extrinsic rewards at the district level is endorsed by principals at the school level. While classroom intervention programs endorsed intrinsic motivation, the superintendent and principals in this district appear to focus on the use of extrinsic rewards for motivating students (Ames, 1989). When actions taken by the district and the school differ from what is happening within the classroom, these perceived differences may limit the extent to which classroom interventions can persist. Communication between the superintendent and principals, and between principals and teachers, may impact the extent to which conflicting viewpoints are perceived by classroom teachers. Although the superintendent strongly advocated the use of business associations and extrinsic rewards, principal adoption of these goals was variable. When principals were asked what they communicated to teachers regarding the reward and recognition of students, they responded that they had not formally discussed this topic with teachers but rather, had informally addressed individual issues as necessary. For example, if principals had adopted various business partnerships or initiated a lunch behavior program - the details were discussed with teachers.

When principals implement policies such as rewards for lunch room behavior, or the use of business partnerships to provide material rewards to a subset of students, this influences the school culture, and may be in conflict with what teachers are trying to accomplish at the classroom level. We can then ask, what effect do these perceived differences have on students? Are mastery goals established at the classroom level being circumvented by performance goals espoused by principals or administrators at the school level? This analysis does not answer these questions but rather suggests through example, that this is entirely possible. Further research is necessary to confirm the existence of conflicting viewpoints between administrators, principals and teachers, and the influence on student goals and motivation. It may be important to expand classroom intervention programs to include principals and administrators if this is confirmed.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the principals interviewed were given the same mandates by the district, there seemed to be considerable variation in practices among the schools. These differences can be interpreted in light of mastery and performance goals. The variation differs not only by school or by principal but also by the TARGET area in which each principal was being questioned. In other words, while one principal may have exhibited more of a mastery orientation in one domain, the same principal may exhibit more of a performance orientation in another domain. In addition, mastery and performance goals of principals coexisted within the same domain. If our goal is to structure the school environment so that a mastery-focus is predominant, administrators, principals, and teachers must be aware of the goals they possess, and must consider how their goals are reflected in practice.

Teachers, principals and administrators influence the nature of school "culture" through the policies and practices that they espouse. This study describes actions by principals that affect the school as a whole, as well as teachers and students within

classrooms. Research is needed that will analyze the actions of principals and assess how they influence the achievement goals of teachers and of students. Previous research has measured teachers' goal orientations, and how they relate to instructional practices (Ames, 1989). This study represents an initial attempt to understand how principals' goals are reflected in the practices they endorse.

Students may be influenced by the actions of teachers and principals, particularly when the two are contradictory. A strengthened and consistent communication of goals between the superintendent, principals, teachers, and students will likely require changes in the policies and practices of administrators and principals. The extent of influence at each level depends on the role of the superintendent and principal, on how well formal and informal policies are communicated and implemented, and in the amount of control each is willing to give to subordinates. The range of variation in policy and practice indicates that administrative constraints within this district may not be as great as might be imagined by teachers or principals. In many cases, teachers may have autonomy within their classrooms, but if the principal is most influential in controlling the school culture - conflicts between what happens within the school and what happens within the classroom may be perceived by teachers as well as students.

From this exploratory study, initial indications are that principals and administrators influence the goal emphases in the school environment. If interventions to move toward a mastery environment at the classroom level are to be successful, administrators and principals must be included in the interventions. Principals and administrators must work in concert with teachers to encourage mastery-oriented strategies within the classroom, the school, and the district. Interventions should involve a 'united front' of mastery-oriented strategies. If the school learning environment is to change, it may be necessary for school leaders to become aware of and examine their goals, and to consider the impact that their goals have on school policy and practice.

References

Ames, C. (1990, April). Achievement goals and classroom structure: Developing a learning orientation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Association, Boston.

Ames, C. (1989). School-home strategies to enhance motivation. Unpublished, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 269-267.

Ames, C., Maehr, M., Archer, J., Fisher, A., & Hall, H. (1989, March). Achievement goals and the structure of learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Anderman, E., Smith, J., & Belzer, S. (1991). Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Blumenfeld, P.C., Pintrich, P., Meece, J., & Wessels, K. (1982). The formation and role of self perceptions of ability in elementary classrooms. Elementary School Journal, 82, 401-420.

Brophy, J. (1983). Conceptualizing student motivation. Educational Psychologist, 18, 200-213.

Dweck, C.S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. American Psychologist, 40, 1040-1048.

Epstein, J.L. (1987b). TARGET: An examination of parallel school and family structures that promote student motivation and achievement. Baltimore: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. Johns Hopkins University.

Kelly, J.R. (1987). Peoria Winter. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Krug, S.E., Ahadi, S.A., & Scott, C.K. (1990). Current issues and research findings in the study of school leadership. Champaign, IL: National Center for School Leadership.

Marshall, H., & Weinstein, R. (1986). Classroom context of student-perceived differential teacher treatment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 441-453.

Maehr, M.L. (in press). The "psychological environment" of the school: A focus for school leadership. In P. Thurston and P. Zodhiates (Eds.) Advances in Educational Administration. Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press.

Maehr, M., & Midgley, C. (in press). Enhancing student motivation: A school-wide approach. Educational Psychology.

Meece, J. (1990). The classroom context and students' motivational goals. In M. Maehr, & P. Pintrich (Eds.) Advances in Motivation and Achievement. Volume 7. Greenwich CT.: JAI Press.

Meece, J., Blumenfeld, P.C., & Hoyle, R. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 514-523.

Midgley, C., & Maehr, M. (1990). Enhancing the motivation and learning of underachieving students: A school-wide approach. (CFDA Number: 84:215A; OMB Number: 1850-0637). Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.

Rosenholtz, S.J., & Simpson, C. (1984). The formulation of ability conceptions: Developmental trend or social construction. Review of Educational Research, 54(1), 31-63.

Ryan, R.M., & Grolnick, W. (1986). Origins and pawns in the classroom: Self-report and projective assessments of individual differences in children's perceptions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 550-558.